UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,830	07/14/2003	Scott Mutchler	60027.0304US01	5928

23552 7590 06/19/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
KARMELEK, ALISON L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,830	MUTCHLER, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALISON KARMELEK	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *14072003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final, first office action upon examination of application number 10/618,830. Claims 1-36 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-12, 14-18 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brodersen et al. (US 2002/0029161 A1).

4. As per claim 1, Brodersen et al. teaches a method of defining a set of business rules during runtime of a software application program in a computer system, the method comprising during runtime of the software application program, (a) specifying a current rule of the set of business rules (paragraphs 15, 42-44 teach a computer program product that is used to add modify or delete rules and modifying the rules database, meaning the current rule of the set of business rules must be specified in order to modify, add, or delete the rule);

(b) defining at least one condition for the current rule (paragraph 43 and 67 teach the user defining assignment criteria, assignment criteria values, workload rules, calendar availability, CTI rules, geographic proximity rules, where the workload,

expertise, geographic proximity, availability, CTI availability, role, territory, skills and user defined values are the conditions set for the current rule);

(c) defining at least one action for the current rule, wherein the at least one action is based on the at least one condition (paragraphs 43, 46 and 68 teach the assignment rules can be for assigning service requests, opportunities, contact, accounts, activities, campaigns and product defects, or actions for the rule);

(d) linking the at least one conduction with the at least one action to define a business rule from the current rule (paragraphs 42-47 teach the tasks are matched using multi way join against the various tables contained in the definition of the task);

(e) repeating operations (a)-(d) until each business rule in the set of business rules has been defined (paragraphs 42-47 teach adding, modifying, deleting rules, Fig. 1).

5. As per claim 2, Brodersen teaches prior to specifying a current rule, creating a rule category for the set of business rules (paragraphs 83-85 teaches the Object within the Assignment Rule (MVG) which opens the Assignment Object, or the rule category for the set of business rules, such as service request, opportunity, etc.);

defining a state object for the current rule, wherein the state object comprises user data relevant to the current rule (paragraph 13 teaches the current rule having eligible assignees, or state object comprising user data relevant to the current rule); and

after linking the at least one condition with the at least one action to define a business rule from the current rule, storing the current rule in the rule category for the set of rules (paragraphs 15, 27, 44 teach storing the rule).

6. As per claim 3, Brodersen teaches the user data comprises fields stored in a database (paragraphs 15, 27, 44 teach storing the rule in a database).

7. As per claim 4, Brodersen teaches the at least one user action updates the fields in the database during runtime of the software application (paragraph 44 teaches modifying the rules database, the employee database and position database through translating the administrator actions, or the user-defined rules).

8. As per claim 8, Brodersen teaches the at least one condition is a pattern condition (paragraph 43 and 67 teach the user defining assignment criteria, assignment criteria values, workload rules, calendar availability, CTI rules, geographic proximity rules, where the workload, expertise, geographic proximity, availability, CTI availability, role, territory, skills and user defined values are the conditions set for the current rule).

9. As per claim 9, Brodersen teaches the at least one condition is structured query language (SQL) condition (paragraphs 43-44 and 67 teach the conditions which are administrator actions and translating those actions into SQL statements to modify the rules database).

10. As per claim 11, Brodersen teaches the at least one action is a pattern action (paragraphs 50 and 70 teach a plurality of actions, or a pattern action).

11. As per claim 12, Brodersen teaches at least one action is a structured query language (SQL) action (paragraph 44 teaches translating those actions into SQL statements to modify the rules database, employee database and position database).

12. As per claim 14, Brodersen teaches a method of evaluating a business rule during runtime of a software application program in a computer system, the method

comprising: during runtime of the software application, retrieving a business rule, wherein the business rule comprises at least one defined condition and at least one defined action (paragraphs 114-128 teaches calling the assignment manager, or receiving the business rules, where paragraph 43 and 67 teach the user defining assignment criteria, assignment criteria values, workload rules, calendar availability, CTI rules, geographic proximity rules, where the workload, expertise, geographic proximity, availability, CTI availability, role, territory, skills and user defined values are the conditions set for the current rule and the assignment rules can be for assigning service requests, opportunities, contact, accounts, activities, campaigns and product defects, or actions for the rule); and

evaluating the business rule based on the at least one defined condition, the at least one defined action and user data in a state object (paragraphs 129-166 teach evaluating the business rule based on the conditions, actions and the user data such as workload, availability, geographic proximity, and other attributes).

13. As per claim 15, Brodersen teaches determining a success of the business rule based on the evaluation (paragraphs 142-149 teaches scoring the qualified candidates, or determining a success).

14. As per claim 16, Brodersen teaches updating existing user data in the state object based on the evaluation of the business rule (paragraphs 160-166 teaches generating the assignment and writing the assignee to the task's primary table and also reassigning or updating the existing user data in the state object).

15. As per claim 17, Brodersen teaches adding new user data to the state object based on the evaluation of the business rules (paragraphs 160-166 teach generating the assignment and writing the assignee to the task's primary table).

16. As per claim 18, Brodersen teaches the business rule is retrieved from a database (paragraphs 15, 27, 72 teach the rules information from the database).

17. As per claims 33-34, they recite a computer system for performing the methods of claims 14-17. Since Brodersen teaches a computer system (paragraph 15), claims 33-34 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 14-17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 5-7, 10, 13, 19-32 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodersen et al..

20. As per claim 5, Brodersen teaches storing the current rule in the rules category as recited in claim 2. However, Brodersen does not expressly teach generating a data file for the stored information and saving the data file in the computer system. Examiner takes Official Notice that generating a data file for information desired to be stored and saving that data file in a computer system is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this feature in the

art of Brodersen as storing the information, whether it be specifically in a data file or not, would not change the functionality of the invention. Further, since saving information in this format is old and well known in the art, substituting this storage format for another would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize the known methods that are available in the field.

21. As per claim 6, Brodersen teaches storing information to the database (paragraphs15, 27, 44). However, as recited above in claim 5. Brodersen does not teach this stored information as a data file. Examiner takes Official Notice that a data file is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the data of Brodersen in a data file as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize the know technologies of the art that are old and well known at the time of the invention. Further, since the format of the data does not alter the functionality of the invention, it would have been obvious to utilize any data format that was old and well known at the time of the invention.

22. As per claim 7, Brodersen teaches storing information as recited in claims 2 and 5. However, Brodersen does not teach the data stored as an XML data file. Examiner takes Official Notice that XML files are old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the data of Brodersen in an XML data file as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize the know technologies of the art that are old and well known at the time of the invention. Further, since the format of the data does not alter the functionality of the invention, it would

have been obvious to utilize any data format that was old and well known at the time of the invention.

23. As per claim 10, Brodersen teaches at least one condition as recited in claim 1. Further, Brodersen teaches the at least one condition is a decision that performs customized operations on the one or more fields (paragraphs 42-48). However, Brodersen does not expressly teach the cusotmized operations being in a script. Examiner takes Official Notice that placing cusomtized operations in a script is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the customized operations of Brodersen in a script in order to more efficiently find an optimal match utilizing the rule conditions and actions. See Brodersen, paragraph 11.

24. As per claim 13, Brodersen teaches at least one action as recited in claim 1. Further, Brodersen teaches the at least one action is an action based on a decisions in which customized operations are performed on one or more fields (paragraphs 42-48). However, Brodersen does not expressly teach the cusotmized operations being in a script. Examiner takes Official Notice that placing cusomtized operations in a script is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the customized operations of Brodersen in a script in order to more efficiently find an optimal match utilizing the rule conditions and actions. See Brodersen, paragraph 11.

25. As per claim 19, Brodersen teaches the business rule is retrieved from a database (paragraphs 15, 27 and 72). However, Brodersen does not expressly teach

the information retrieved from a file. Examiner takes Official Notice that retrieving stored information from a file is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include file data in the data that is stored in the database of Brodersen as the format of the data does not change the functionality of the invention. Further, substituting one type of data for another would have been obvious as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize any data format that is old and well known in the art as it does not change the functionality of the invention.

26. As per claim 20 it recites limitations substantially similar to those of claims 8-10 and is rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 8-10.

27. As per claim 21, it recites limitations substantially similar to those of claims 11-13 and is rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 11-13.

28. As per claim 22, Brodersen teaches a computer readable medium having computer executable modules for defining and executing a set of business rules comprising: a rule designer module for: creating a rule category for the set of business rules (paragraphs 83-85 teaches the Object within the Assignment Rule (MVG) which opens the Assignment Object, or the rule category for the set of business rules, such as service request, opportunity, etc);

(a) specifying a current rule of the set of business rules (paragraphs 15, 42-44 teach a computer program product that is used to add modify or delete rules and modifying the rules database, meaning the current rule of the set of business rules must be specified in order to modify, add, or delete the rule);

(b) defining at least one condition for the current rule (paragraph 43 and 67 teach the user defining assignment criteria, assignment criteria values, workload rules, calendar availability, CTI rules, geographic proximity rules, where the workload, expertise, geographic proximity, availability, CTI availability, role, territory, skills and user defined values are the conditions set for the current rule);

(c) defining at least one action for the current rule, wherein the at least one action is based on the at least one condition (paragraphs 43, 46 and 68 teach the assignment rules can be for assigning service requests, opportunities, contact, accounts, activities, campaigns and product defects, or actions for the rule);

(d) linking the at least one conduction with the at least one action to define a business rule from the current rule (paragraphs 42-47 teach the tasks are matched using multi way join against the various tables contained in the definition of the task);

(e) generating data representing the defined business rule (paragraph 44);

(f) repeating operations (a)-(e) for each business rule in the business rule category (paragraphs 42-47 teach adding, modifying, deleting rules, Fig. 1);

storing the data generated for each defined business rule in the rule category (Fig. 1, paragraphs 15, 27, 44 teach storing the rule);

a rules engine module for evaluating each of the business rule in the rule category (paragraphs 129-166 teach evaluating the business rule based on the conditions, actions and the user data such as workload, availability, geographic proximity, and other attributes).

However, Brodersen does not expressly teach the data as a data file. Examiner takes Official Notice that Examiner takes Official Notice that a data file is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the data of Brodersen in a data file as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize the know technologies of the art that are old and well known at the time of the invention. Further, since the format of the data does not alter the functionality of the invention, it would have been obvious to utilize any data format that was old and well known at the time of the invention.

29. As per claim 23, Brodersen teaches the user data comprises fields stored in a database (paragraphs 15, 27, 44 teach storing the rule in a database).

30. As per claim 24, Brodersen teaches the rules module evaluating each business rule based on the at least one condition and the at least one or more action (paragraphs 129-166 teach evaluating the business rule based on the conditions, actions and the user data such as workload, availability, geographic proximity, and other attributes).

31. As per claims 25-28 and 30-31, they recite limitations substantially similar to those of claims 8-13, respectively. Thus, claims 25-28 and 30-31 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 8-13.

32. As per claim 29, Brodersen teaches the pattern action uses dynamic binding (paragraphs 26 and 52 teach the assignment or the pattern action, is defined dynamically, or dynamically bound).

33. As per claim 32, Brodersen teaches a system for defining a set of business rules comprising: a rule designer module for: a) specifying a current rule of the set of

business rules (paragraphs 15, 42-44 teach a computer program product that is used to add modify or delete rules and modifying the rules database, meaning the current rule of the set of business rules must be specified in order to modify, add, or delete the rule);

(b) defining a state object for the current rule, wherein the state object comprises one or more data objects, each data object containing user data relevant to the current rule (paragraph 13 teaches the current rule having eligible assignees, or state object comprising user data relevant to the current rule)

(c) defining at least one condition for the current rule (paragraph 43 and 67 teach the user defining assignment criteria, assignment criteria values, workload rules, calendar availability, CTI rules, geographic proximity rules, where the workload, expertise, geographic proximity, availability, CTI availability, role, territory, skills and user defined values are the conditions set for the current rule);

(d) defining at least one action for the current rule, wherein the at least one action is based on the at least one condition (paragraphs 43, 46 and 68 teach the assignment rules can be for assigning service requests, opportunities, contact, accounts, activities, campaigns and product defects, or actions for the rule);

(e) linking the at least one conduction with the at least one action to define a business rule from the current rule (paragraphs 42-47 teach the tasks are matched using multi way join against the various tables contained in the definition of the task);

(f) generating data representing the defined business rule (paragraph 44);

(g) repeating operations (a)-(f) for each business rule in the business rule category (paragraphs 42-47 teach adding, modifying, deleting rules, Fig. 1);

a database for storing the user data for in the data object defined by the rules engine module (Fig. 1, paragraphs 15, 27, 44 teach storing the rule).

However, Brodersen does not expressly teach the data as a data file. Examiner takes Official Notice that Examiner takes Official Notice that a data file is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the data of Brodersen in a data file as it is within one of ordinary skill in the art's ability to utilize the know technologies of the art that are old and well known at the time of the invention. Further, since the format of the data does not alter the functionality of the invention, it would have been obvious to utilize any data format that was old and well known at the time of the invention.

34. As per claims 35-36, they recite a computer system for performing the methods of claims 20 and 21. Since Brodersen teaches a system (paragraph 15), claims 35-36 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 20 and 21.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mullins (US Pub. 2002/0091702 A1) teaches dynamic object-driven database manipulation and mapping system.

Wright et al. (US 7,363,594) teaches a workflow event editor with defining, monitoring and modifying a workflow.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALISON KARMELEK whose telephone number is (571)272-1808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Van Doren can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AK
6/13/08
/A. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/C. Michelle Tarae/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623